REMARKS

Status of the claims

In the Final Action of 27 October 2011, claims 19, 21-27, 30, 34-35, 37-43 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over previously-cited Ausems in view of previously-cited Kumar and Bonansea et al., US 6868283 ("Bonansea"). Claims 28-29, 31-33, 44-45, 46 and 48-50 stand rejected under 35 usc 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ausems, Kumar and Bonansea, in further view of Castell et al., US 7283808 ("Castell").

Claim 19 has been amended to recite that the plurality of messages received is "from a plurality of senders", that a "plurality of message listings associated with a selected one of the plurality of senders" is displayed in the screen, and that the newly received message indicated in the "new message area" is "associated with the selected sender". These features are supported by at least paragraphs [0036], [0039] and [0040] of the originally filed description, as well as FIG. 4. Similar amendments have been made to claim 35.

Claim 31 has been amended to recite the display of a "separate screen", which comprises a "main application screen comprising a plurality of icons each associated with a different application", as well as first and second icons associated with the selected sender. These features are supported by at least paragraphs [0034] to [0037] and FIGS. 2 and 3. Similar amendments have been made to claim 48.

Claims 32 and 49 have been amended to recite "storing each of the received plurality of messages in a corresponding one of a plurality of message stores, each message store being associated with a different message type, and wherein displaying the plurality of message listings comprises retrieving message data for messages associated with the selected sender from each of the plurality of message stores, each of the at least one indicator of at least one message comprising retrieved message data for that message", which is supported by at least paragraphs [0029], [0030] and [0040].

Additional amendments for clarity and consistency were also made. No new matter has been added.

No disclosure of message listings for a "selected sender" as recited in the independent claims

The independent claims have been amended to specify that the displayed screen comprises a number of message listings that are "associated with a selected one of the plurality of senders", from whom messages are received. Each message area comprises a corresponding message listing, and each of these message listings comprise "at least one indicator of at least one message associated with the selected sender"; in addition, the "new message area" that is disposed along a top portion of the screen provides an indication of a newly received message from that selected sender. In other words, in the amended independent claims, the message-related content provided in the recited screen is associated with a particular one of the senders that has sent messages received by the communication device.

The cited references, however, do not teach this type of selection in displaying messages. The display in Ausems is apparently a general list of incoming messages from multiple senders; see FIG. 3, for example, which lists messages from senders "Iris", "Henry" and "Mike". Table 2 of Ausems describes that this display provides a list of recently received or transmitted SMS and email addresses. The screens illustrated in Kumar do not display messages associated with a particular sender of messages to the user's computer; in FIG. 11 of Kumar, for example, there is only an indication (223) that a number of new emails are available. These emails may be sourced from a number of user accounts (column 29, lines 22-23). In any event, all the content in Kumar's screen relates to the user of the computing device displaying the screen (column 27, lines 12-16; the user accesses services via the portal interface); it does not relate to one particular entity sending messages to the user. As for Bonansea, there is no teaching that events that are displayed in the display region shown in FIG. 7B are selected according to the sender (if any) of the event.

Thus, the cited combination of references fails to provide each and every element of the amended independent claims. The Applicant therefore submits that these claims are patentable over the Ausems-Kumar-Bonansea combination. Since all the remaining claims are dependent on one of these two independent claims, the Applicant submits the remaining claims are also patentable over the cited combination for at least the same reason.

No disclosure of displaying first and second icons

Dependent claims 31 and 48 now recite, in part:

> displaying, in a separate screen on the communication device, a main application screen comprising a plurality of icons each associated with a different application;

> displaying in the separate screen, a first icon associated with the selected sender when there are no new unread messages stored at the communication device associated with the selected sender; and

> displaying, in the separate screen, a second icon associated with the selected sender in place of the first icon upon receipt of a new message at the communication device from the selected sender.

These features are not disclosed by the cited combinations of references. None of these references provide a screen comprising a plurality of icons associated with a number of applications, where the screen also includes a sender-specific icon (i.e., the first or second icon).

Moreover, none of these references disclose the display of a first icon associated with a selected sender when there are no new unread messages, and the display of a second icon in place of the first upon receipt of a new message from that selected sender.

Therefore, for this additional reason, the Applicant submits that claims 31 and 48 are patentable over the cited art.

No disclosure of storage in and retrieval from a "plurality of message stores"

Dependent claims 32 and 49 now recite, in part, "storing each of the received plurality of messages in a corresponding one of a plurality of message stores, each message store being associated with a different message type" and that the display of message listings comprises "retrieving message data for messages associated with the selected sender from each of the plurality of message stores, each of the at least one indicator of at least one message comprising retrieved message data for that message". This is not disclosed by the cited Ausems-Kumar-

Bonansea combination, given that none of these references discloses the selection of messages to display in message listings based on a selection of a sender.

Moreover, it may be noted that Ausems, Kumar and Bonansea are silent as to the precise manner in which messages of different types are stored in message stores at their respective user devices.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Date: March 23, 2012

_____/Jenna L. Wilson/_____
Jenna L. Wilson
Registration No. 54908
Tel: 647.288.9532